

Message

From: Zimmerman, Jan@Waterboards [jan.zimmerman@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: 1/15/2016 5:56:00 PM
To: Nate Bello [bello@wra-ca.com]; Pankratz, Shannon L SPL [Shannon.L.Pankratz@usace.army.mil]; Lawhead, David@Wildlife [David.Lawhead@wildlife.ca.gov]; Mahdavi, Sarvy [Mahdavi.Sarvy@epa.gov]; Tracey Brownfield [tracey@landveritas.com]; Julie Beeman [JBeeman@vcsenvironmental.com]; Keelie Rocker [KRocker@vcsenvironmental.com]; Tim DeGraff [degraff@wra-ca.com]; Kyra Engelberg [engelberg@wra-ca.com]; Aaron Allen [aaron.o.allen@usace.army.mil]
CC: Copeland, Patrice@Waterboards [patrice.copeland@waterboards.ca.gov]; Niemeyer, Kim@Waterboards [Kim.Niemeyer@waterboards.ca.gov]
Subject: RE: Petersen Ranch Mitigation Bank - Final BEI
Attachments: BEI 12-15-15 clean_WATER BOARD COMMENTS_01152016.docx; Exhibit E-4 2 Conservation Easement PR Area A 12-23-15_WATER BOARD COMMENTS_01152016.docx

Shannon et al., our comments on the latest version of the BEI and the Conservation Easement are outlined below.

Bank Enabling Instrument (BEI)

The BEI notes that the Petersen Ranch Property Owner owns 3,912 acres (paragraph B of recitals) and that the bank will be created over a 3,735 acre portion of the Petersen Ranch property (recital paragraph E). What happens with the remaining 177 acre portion of the property that is not part of the bank? Will it be held in some use that is compatible with the conservation easement? Does this include a portion of the 320 acres for the SCE conserved property described in recital paragraph D?

Additional comment on the BEI provided separately as track changes on "clean" version. See attached.

Conservation Easement

The Conservation Easement is only for 1844.6 areas. Why would the conservation easement not cover all of the 3,735 acres that make up the Petersen Ranch bank?

The Conservation Easement refers back and forth between "IRT" and "Signatory Agencies." In earlier comments and responses on the BEI, it was agreed that "IRT" would be used instead of "Signatory Agencies." Please use "IRT" for consistency throughout.

What is the relationship/role of the Grantee, Southwest Resource Management Agency? Please provide more information about this entity and their roles/responsibilities? It appears that the Grantee is responsible for ensuring that the work identified in the various plans identified in the BEI is being done. It seems appropriate to identify the Grantee and specify their roles/responsibilities in the BEI.

Additional comments on the Conservation Easement provided separately as track changes on "clean" version. See attached.

Thank you!

Jan Zimmerman, PG
Engineering Geologist
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
Phone: 760/241-7376
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/>

From: Nate Bello [mailto:bello@wra-ca.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 23, 2015 11:02 AM
To: Pankratz, Shannon L SPL; Lawhead, David@Wildlife; Sarvy Mahdavi; Zimmerman, Jan@Waterboards; Tracey

Brownfield; Julie Beeman; Keelie Rocker; Tim DeGraff; Kyra Engelberg; Aaron Allen
Subject: Re: Petersen Ranch Mitigation Bank - Final BEI

Hi all,

Sorry for the follow up. I got a message that some of your servers blocked the email message because of the attached zip file. I didn't want to risk any of you not receiving the email, so I am sending again with the uncompressed attachments.

Nate

Nathan Bello | Conservation Biologist/Planner | d: 415.524.7238 | o: 415.454.8868 x 1800 | c: 916.508.4993 | bello@wra-ca.com

WRA, Inc. | www.wra-ca.com | 2169-G East Francisco Blvd., San Rafael, CA 94901 | San Diego | Fort Bragg | Denver

On Wed, Dec 23, 2015 at 10:56 AM, Nate Bello <bello@wra-ca.com> wrote:

Hi all,

Attached are three versions each of the BEI and CE for the Petersen Ranch M.B. Included is a clean version, a version in tracked changes from the template, and a version in tracked changes from the last version reviewed by the IRT. These versions should reflect the most recent language that has been agreed to in the ongoing discussions between the various legal counsels. The IRT should now have all of the revised documents based on the comments we received on the last BEI submittal and subsequent conversations.

With this submittal I believe all outstanding issues have been addressed and we look forward to getting this signed. If all IRT agencies agree that these documents look good, we can submit hard copies and coordinate signing. If you have any questions don't hesitate to contact me.

These documents have also been uploaded to the ftp site:

[FTP://50.76.51.173](ftp://50.76.51.173)

Username: PetersenRanch

Password: Petersen\$

Thank you all for your significant contributions of time and effort on this project,

Nate

Nathan Bello | Conservation Biologist/Planner | d: 415.524.7238 | o: 415.454.8868 x 1800 | c: 916.508.4993 | bello@wra-ca.com

WRA, Inc. | www.wra-ca.com | 2169-G East Francisco Blvd., San Rafael, CA 94901 | San Diego | Fort Bragg | Denver

On Fri, Dec 11, 2015 at 5:40 PM, Nate Bello <bello@wra-ca.com> wrote:

Hello all,

Attached please find the tracked changes version of the revised Development Plan (Exhibit C-1) and Crediting Evaluation with Appendix A (Exhibit F-1). These have been revised to reflect the latest comments from CDFW and the Corps. The comments have been added to the end of the comments matrix, which is also attached for your reference.

The complete Development Plan, including figures, can be found on the FTP site:

[FTP://50.76.51.173](ftp://50.76.51.173)

Username: PetersenRanch

Password: Petersen\$

The BEI, CE and LTMP are still awaiting final resolution on a few legal issues that are being worked out between Braiden and counsel from CDFW and the Regional Board. These will be submitted as soon as that language is finalized.

Thank you, please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Nate

Nathan Bello | Conservation Biologist/Planner | d: 415.524.7238 | o: 415.454.8868 x 1800 | c: 916.508.4993 | bello@wra-ca.com

WRA, Inc. | www.wra-ca.com | 2169-G East Francisco Blvd., San Rafael, CA 94901 | San Diego | Fort Bragg | Denver